

REMARKS

As a preliminary matter, applicant appreciates the examiner's continued courtesy and attention to this case. Applicant also appreciates the examiners consideration in a telephone interview conducted on December 1, 2005, with Examiner Li, Patrick Burns and Matthew Hitching. The present claim amendments reflect the examiner's summary of the interview. Any other topics discussed are reflected in the following remarks.

As another preliminary matter, applicant appreciates the allowance of claim 32.

Claims 1, 3, 14 and 15 stand objected to due to several informalities. These claims have been amended in the manner suggested by the examiner, to overcome these objections.

Claim 10 [sic 30] stands rejected under § 101. Claim 30 has been amended to more clearly define a signal which produces a useful, tangible result in a processor. Signals are considered tangible, and a useful result obtained with something tangible defines patentable subject matter. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 14, 15 and 30 stand rejected under § 112.

These claims have been amended to overcome this rejection.

Claim 14 has been amended as suggested by the examiner.

Claim 15 has been amended to more clearly distinguish between the processor recited in the preamble, and the method steps now recited in the body of the claim.

Claim 30 has been amended to more clearly recite that the signals cause a processor to execute certain operations, without claiming the processor itself or specific

functions of the processor structure. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-4, 9-15 and 31-32 stand rejected under § 102 on the basis of MIPS16.

To overcome this rejection, the claims have been amended as suggested by the examiner during the recent interview, by reciting that the mutually-corresponding F1-F2 opcode bits in the two external formats F1 and F2 are purposefully identical to one another. In addition, the former references to “first operations” have been removed. Instead, claim 1 now refers to “a set of operations made up of all of the operations that are executable by the processor” and then states that “for every one of the operations of said set of operations that is specifiable both in said first and second external formats...”. Applicant submits that this language more clearly avoids the cited reference because the “identical common opcode bits requirement” must be met for every operation (within the total set of executable operations) that is specifiable in both external formats. The MIPS16 processor only meets the requirement concerned for a subset of the operations that are specifiable in both external formats. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 5-8 stand rejected under § 103 on the basis of MIPS16 and Lin ‘969.

Applicants traverse this rejection for the reasons given with respect to the independent claims. Withdrawal is requested.

In addition to the claim amendments described, several claims have been further amended, in an effort to avoid rejections based on § 101 and § 112. Applicant hopes that this will expedite prosecution.

For the foregoing reasons, applicant believes that this case is in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested. The examiner should call applicant's attorney if an interview would expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By



Patrick G. Burns

Registration No. 29,367

January 9, 2006

300 South Wacker Drive
Suite 2500
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Telephone: 312.360.0080
Facsimile: 312.360.9315

Customer No. 24978